

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: JOHN D. FRANZINI QUARLES & BRADY LLP 411 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE MILWAUKEE, WI 53202		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 24 JUN 2005
Applicant's or agent's file reference 100075.00004		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/US05/02244	International filing date (day/month/year) 20 January 2005 (20.01.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 23 January 2004 (23.01.2004)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): F16G 13/00 and US Cl.: 59/78.1; 248/49, 51		
Applicant A&A MFG. CO., INC		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer David B Jones Telephone No. 703-308-1148
--	---

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/02244

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

contained in international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.
PCT/US05/02244

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>3-10 and 12-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-2 and 11</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>3-6, 8-10 and 12-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-2, 7 and 11</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-30</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-2 and 11 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Santucci et al or Anderson et al. Both references teach a monolithic body made of two sides with one side of each member being connected while the other side of each member being free and connectable.

Claim 7 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Anderson et al or Santucci et al. Anderson et al and Santucci et al teach the claimed invention except for the specific material of the cable carrier being that of urethane or PVC. Such materials are well known in the art of chain carriers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the carrier of Anderson et al with urethane or other materials which would provide for a flexible and protective carrier.

Claims 3-6, 8-10 and 12-30 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a carrier including sides of different materials having different hardness.

Claims 1-30 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.